



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and various attempts have been made to relieve the inconsistency. Dr. Simpson has reviewed the history of the Eucharist from the beginning and taken careful account of all these attempts. His concluding chapter on "Practical Conclusions" sums up the whole matter. The eucharistic ideal must be held up, non-communicating attendance should be permitted, but the impression should prevail that deception is a solemn individual responsibility, to be determined by each. "Until the Eucharist is thus fully restored to its central place every Lord's Day in our churches, the people are being deprived of the highest expression of worship of which the English Church is capable."

EDMUNDSON, GEORGE. *The Church in Rome in the First Century*. (The Bampton Lectures for 1913.) London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co. xiv+296 pages. \$2.50.

The apostle Peter founded the Roman church during a visit to Rome in the years 42-45. He then returned to Jerusalem to take part in the events of Gal. 2:1-10 and spent the period 47-54 in missionary work in the East, with Antioch as his headquarters. In the next year, after laboring in Corinth, he paid Rome a second visit and stayed until 56, so compelling Paul (with whom, however, he was on the most friendly terms and in perfect theological agreement) to remain away from the city. The Roman church had now become a large and influential body but it was recruited almost entirely from Jews and semi-proselytes, and as yet contained only a handful of anti-Pauline Judaizers. Peter's third visit took place in 63 and was terminated by his martyrdom in the early summer of 65. However, Peter and Paul were never in Rome simultaneously. The latter was released from prison in 62, worked in Spain and later in the East, returned to Rome in 66, and was martyred there in 67.

On Peter's second visit to Rome he completed the organization of the church by choosing from its presbyters a triumvirate of *episcopi*, Linus, Anacletus, and Clement. After the apostle's death these selected Linus to succeed him as supreme governor of the church, but all three shared in the general direction of affairs. But no new *co-episcopi* were afterward elected, and by the successive deaths of Linus (in 80) and Anacletus (in 92), Clement finally became sole ruler. Thus the monarchical episcopate was developed at Rome.

With this historical scheme, considerable readjustments of the literary evidence become necessary. As self-effacement is impossible for a monarchical bishop, Clement's epistle must be dated back before 70. Similarly, the vagueness of references to church government in Heras makes a date prior to 92 needful for it, while on the other hand the Didache is dismissed as a fourth-century forgery. After this it is no surprise to read that the Second Gospel was written in 45 or that authentic portraits of Peter and Paul have been preserved.

The foregoing structure speaks for itself and a detailed criticism is hardly worth while. Scholarship doubtless may often have been at fault in treating the later Roman traditions too contemptuously and more historic truth may be embodied in them than is now generally admitted. But Mr. Edmundson's canonization of the legends will not help much in clearing up the problems. Unfortunately his undisguised purpose has been not to follow the guiding of the earliest data but to show how by violent wrenching these data can be forced to fit into a preconceived scheme. In a Bampton Lecture series such a method is particularly deplorable; an apologetic that represents faith as depending on a most precarious series of "may have been's" is of all things most mistaken.